

**Building Tests To Support
Instruction and Accountability**
A Guide for Policymakers

Prepared By

The Commission on Instructionally Supportive Assessment

Convened By

American Association of School Administrators
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Education Association
National Middle School Association

October 2001

Members of the Commission on Instructionally Supportive Assessment

Eva L. Baker
Professor of Educational Psychology and Social Research Methods
Co-Director, National Center for Research
on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing
Graduate School of Education and Information Studies
University of California, Los Angeles

David C. Berliner
Regents' Professor of Education
College of Education
Arizona State University

Carol Camp Yeakey
Professor of Urban Politics and Policy
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia

James W. Pellegrino
Distinguished Professor of Cognitive Psychology
Distinguished Professor of Education
University of Illinois at Chicago

W. James Popham (Chair)
Professor Emeritus
Graduate School of Education and Information Studies
University of California, Los Angeles

Rachel F. Quenemoen
Senior Fellow for Technical Assistance and Research
National Center on Educational Outcomes
University of Minnesota

Flora V. Rodríguez-Brown
Professor of Curriculum and Instruction/Reading, Writing and Literacy
University of Illinois at Chicago

Paul D. Sandifer (Ret.)
Consultant to the Office of Assessment
South Carolina Department of Education

Stephen G. Sireci
Associate Professor
School of Education
Center for Educational Assessment
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Martha L. Thurlow
Senior Research Associate, Department of Educational Psychology
College of Education and Human Development
Director, National Center on Educational Outcomes
University of Minnesota

Commission members' affiliations do not denote institutional endorsement of the Commission's report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State-mandated accountability tests must be useful to educators concerned about improving the instruction of children.

The Commission on Instructionally Supportive Assessment, in support of this assertion, presents nine requirements for a new generation of statewide achievement tests. The Commission believes that tests written to these requirements will benefit students by providing educators with information they can use to improve the quality of instruction. At the same time, the tests will provide states with information to hold educators, schools, and school districts accountable for student performance.

Clearly, state policymakers who pass accountability legislation have in mind this dual outcome of assessing and improving student performance. But, all too often, while state-administered achievement tests measure performance, they have little value for instruction. This minimizes their usefulness in an accountability system that assumes information from tests will result in appropriate changes in instruction.

To address this problem, the Commission calls for states to use the nine requirements as steps to create responsible state assessment systems, including tests that improve both learning and accountability. Each requirement is supported by reasons for its importance.

The nine requirements are:

Requirement 1: A state's content standards must be prioritized to support effective instruction and assessment.

Requirement 2: A state's high-priority content standards must be clearly and thoroughly described so that the knowledge and skills students need to demonstrate competence are evident.

Requirement 3: The results of a state's assessment of high-priority content standards should be reported standard-by-standard for each student, school, and district.

Requirement 4: The state must provide educators with optional classroom assessment procedures that can measure students' progress in attaining content standards not assessed by state tests.

Requirement 5: A state must monitor the breadth of the curriculum to ensure that instructional attention is given to all content standards and subject areas, including those that are not assessed by state tests.

Requirement 6: A state must ensure that all students have the opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of state standards; consequently, it must provide well-designed assessments appropriate for a broad range of students, with accommodations and alternate methods of assessment available for students who need them.

Requirement 7: A state must generally allow test developers a minimum of three years to produce statewide tests that satisfy *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* and similar test-quality guidelines.

Requirement 8: A state must ensure that educators receive professional development focused on how to optimize children's learning based on the results of instructionally supportive assessments.

Requirement 9: A state should secure evidence that supports the ongoing improvement of its state assessments to ensure those assessments are (a) appropriate for the accountability purposes for which they are used, (b) appropriate for determining whether students have attained state standards, (c) appropriate for enhancing instruction, and (d) not the cause of negative consequences.

The Commission of nationally recognized experts in assessment, curriculum, and instruction was convened by five national associations representing administrators and teachers: American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Education Association, and National Middle School Association.

Table of Contents

Preface	ix
Foreword	x
Introduction	xii
Requirements for the Development of Instructionally Supportive Assessments	1
Requirement 1	2
Requirement 2	3
Requirement 3	4
Requirement 4	5
Requirement 5	6
Requirement 6	7
Requirement 7	8
Requirement 8	9
Requirement 9	10
A Shared Responsibility	11
Commission Members	13

PREFACE

The individuals who prepared this report were asked to recommend ways that state-administered achievement tests could not only satisfy public demands for accountability, but also improve the instruction of children. I had the privilege of selecting the Commission's members from a list of nominees submitted by a coalition of administrator and teacher organizations. I used two criteria. First, I wanted different perspectives represented. Second, I wanted individuals who possessed recognized expertise in assessment and/or instruction. As a Commission, we functioned with complete autonomy. Members of the commission received no remuneration for their work, other than reimbursement for travel expenses. We appreciate the opportunity to consider independently this important educational issue.

W. James Popham
Commission Chair

FOREWORD

Educators who assume the tremendous responsibility of ensuring a quality education for all children can be effective only with the support and encouragement of the larger society. State-mandated standards are a form of encouragement. They signal to educators that the public supports educational improvement for every child, regardless of his or her background. Teachers and administrators agree that, when done well, state standards can increase academic rigor, strengthen curricula, and encourage student learning. But when the standards are linked to state tests, particularly those with high-stakes consequences, educators have understandable concerns.

All too often educators' legitimate concerns about state assessment are not heard by reform-minded policymakers. Worried that they'll be accused of running from accountability, teachers, principals, and superintendents publicly embrace state assessments while they fret privately about their negative impact on sound teaching and learning.

This dilemma brought together five associations that serve the needs of classroom teachers, school principals, and district superintendents. Our associations acknowledged that those who mandate state tests frequently believe our ties to our respective memberships negate the impartiality of our concerns. We then agreed that it would take an independent group of nationally recognized experts in assessment, curriculum, and instruction to attract the attention of state policymakers and urge them to reexamine their assessment systems. Only then, we concluded, would assessment systems be improved so that everyone—educators, policymakers, parents, and the public at large—could be confident that accountability requirements are linked to sound teaching and learning.

W. James Popham, noted research scholar and professor emeritus of the University of California, Los Angeles, was tapped to convene the Commission and serve as its chair.

Commission members include nationally recognized authorities in assessment, curriculum, and instruction, who have brought a wide breadth of knowledge and experience to this effort.

The five associations enthusiastically embrace the result of the Commission's deliberations and applaud its bold assertion that a state's assessment system must meet nine requirements to be seen as credible. We recognize that the Commission makes no mention of what it might cost states to implement truly effective assessment systems. The costs will vary across states, of course. Some have already made major investments in their systems; others have a long way to go. But without an adequate assessment system, neither educators, parents, policymakers, nor the public will know if their expectations for educational quality are being met.

We thank Dr. Popham and the other Commissioners for their hard work and we appreciate their clearly written report. We urge our respective memberships to read the Commission's report. And then we ask them to use it together to begin anew the dialogue with state policymakers about the efficacy of their assessment systems.

Teachers, principals, and district superintendents will readily embrace accountability measures if they are tied to effective assessment systems designed and implemented to improve classroom instruction. Our hope is that policymakers will too.

Finally, we acknowledge our association colleagues who made this collaborative activity possible. Particular thanks go to Marcella Dianda of NEA for her leadership role. Others involved from inception through completion were Gail Gross of NAESP, John Nori of NASSP, and Cynthia Prince and Joe Schneider of AASA.

Paul D. Houston
Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

Vincent L. Ferrandino
Executive Director
National Association of Elementary School Principals

Gerald N. Tirozzi
Executive Director
National Association of Secondary School Principals

Robert E. Chase
President
National Education Association

Sue Swaim
Executive Director
National Middle School Association

INTRODUCTION

This report evolved in response to the question: Why shouldn't state-mandated accountability tests also be useful to educators concerned about improving the instruction of children? Simply put, why can't state tests be designed so that the results are useful to educators as they revamp instruction to improve student achievement? Clearly, the policymakers who pass such legislation have this dual outcome in mind. But, all too often, federally mandated and state-administered tests seem to have little instructional utility, thus bringing into question their usefulness in an accountability system that assumes that information obtained from tests will result in appropriate changes in instruction.

The Commission on Instructionally Supportive Assessment was convened at the request of a coalition of administrator and teacher organizations. We accepted the coalition's request for assistance because we believe the current focus on educational testing offers an exceptional opportunity to create assessments that can help the nation's children learn better. If tests help teachers do a better job in the classroom, then they will truly be *instructionally supportive*. Moreover, we believe that such assessments can provide policymakers with the kind of meaningful evidence needed to satisfy today's educational accountability demands. Consequently, we have written this report specifically for state policymakers to help them establish educational policies that will lead to the development of tests supportive of both instruction and accountability.

We do not believe that the results of a single test should ever be used to make significant decisions that affect schools or students. The tests we recommend will, however, provide one important source of evidence for key educational decisions.

Our report contains nine requirements that must be met to ensure *a responsible educational assessment system for the improvement of learning*. Certainly, policymakers

might satisfy these requirements in various ways. One approach would be to draw on the capabilities of state agencies, such as a state's department of education, to carry out certain of the required activities. Another would be to have the state issue a competitive request for proposals (RFP) to firms and individuals capable of carrying out one or more of the Commission-required activities.

The Commission has issued a separate report to assist state authorities who choose to rely on RFPs and external contractors to obtain necessary products and/or services. That report provides illustrative language that might be incorporated into RFPs to satisfy any of the Commission's nine requirements. (See *Illustrative Language for an RFP To Build Tests To Support Instruction and Accountability*, 2001, available online from each convening association.)

The Commission recognizes that most states have intended to create assessment systems aimed at improving instructional quality. This document is an effort to help ensure that such a goal is reached.

**Requirements for the Development
of Instructionally Supportive Assessments**

The Commission believes that states will create responsible assessments for the improvement of students' learning if they implement the nine requirements we describe on the following pages.

Requirement 1

A state's content standards must be prioritized to support effective instruction and assessment.

Because —

- *educators in many states cannot adequately address within the amount of time available for instruction the large number of content standards that are supposedly measured by state tests;*
- *state tests often do not adequately assess all of the content standards, and frequently center on standards that are easiest to assess; and*
- *state tests rarely provide educators with the kind of information they need to improve instruction.*

Nearly every state has developed two kinds of standards. Content standards focus on knowledge and skills educators are expected to teach. Performance standards focus on students' proficiency in demonstrating the knowledge and skills described in the content standards. The Commission's requirements address content standards. Requirement 1 obliges a state to review and rank-order its content standards using a process open to all relevant stakeholders—for instance, educators, parents, and other concerned citizens. This will result in a set of high-priority content standards that will assist educators and guide test developers by directing their attention to a limited, manageable set of standards.

The purpose of this prioritization is to identify a small number of content standards, suitable for large-scale assessment, that represent the most important or enduring skills and knowledge students need to learn in school. Standards that focus on discrete skills and knowledge may first need to be subsumed or grouped under larger conceptions of what students should know and be able to do, so that a smaller number of key content standards can be prioritized.

At the same time, the Commission recognizes that even the most thoughtful prioritization of content standards could inadvertently lead to a narrowed curriculum in which attention focuses on the high priority content standards to the exclusion of other standards. Requirements 4 and 5 are designed to counter this adverse consequence.

Requirement 2

A state’s high-priority content standards must be clearly and thoroughly described so that the knowledge and skills students need to demonstrate competence are evident.

Because —

- *a state’s high-priority content standards will be measured by state tests;*
- *educators must understand what each of these content standards calls for from students; and*
- *many content standards are not worded with sufficient clarity for rigorous instructional planning and assessment design.*

Members of the Commission regard it as self-evident that better teaching and better testing are more likely if educators understand clearly where they need to focus their efforts and test-developers understand clearly what they are supposed to test. Therefore, we recommend that states analyze their high-priority content standards to identify what students must do and understand to demonstrate they have achieved the standards.

This analysis should result in relatively brief, educator-friendly descriptions of each high-priority content standard’s meaning by identifying the skills and knowledge that should be the focus of instruction. To be most useful, the standards and descriptions need to be articulated across grade levels. That is, they should identify age- or grade-appropriate skills and knowledge that build from grade to grade so students learn all the requisites to attain the state’s high-priority standards.

Requirement 3

The results of a state’s assessment of high-priority content standards should be reported standard-by-standard for each student, school, and district.

Because —

- *students, parents, educators, and policymakers need information about which content standards students are and are not attaining; and*
- *educators can do little to improve students’ achievement without information about their performance on each high-priority content standard.*

The Commission believes that standard-by-standard reporting of students’ performance on state tests is critical to the success of standards-based educational reform. We recognize, however, that if states are to provide adequate information about students’ skills and knowledge on a per-standard basis, students typically will need to answer several test items for each content standard that is assessed. And this means, of course, that fewer content standards can be assessed by state tests given typical time constraints. This is one reason the Commission calls for states to prioritize their content standards (see Requirement 1). We recognize that, for school accountability, it may be necessary in some instances to aggregate results across standards.

Standard-by-standard reports provide educators and parents with important information they currently do not have regarding each content standard. Having this information will enable educators to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction related to each standard, and then improve instruction where needed. Standard-by-standard reports also will provide parents with more specific information about what their children are learning in school.

Of course, it is also necessary to alert educators to measurement issues that arise when information is based on only one source and on potentially few assessment items, especially for individual students. This information is likely to be less than reliable, and

may be a less than accurate measure of a student's true knowledge and skills. Teachers, especially, must bring additional sources of classroom-based information to their evaluation and intervention decisions for individual students.

The Commission also recognizes that focusing state tests on a smaller number of high-priority content standards creates the possibility that educators will attend so much to these standards that other standards and subject areas will receive reduced attention. We address this issue in Requirements 4 and 5.

Requirement 4

A state must provide educators with optional classroom assessment procedures that can measure students’ progress in attaining content standards not assessed by state tests.

Because —

- *content standards that are not assessed by state tests are important and should be given instructional attention;*
- *educators need good assessment tools to monitor students’ achievement and rarely have the time and resources to develop such tools; and*
- *assessments that are routinely administered by educators can and should be used to provide a complete picture of what students know and are able to do.*

For purposes of per-standard assessment, statewide tests must measure a limited number of high-priority content standards. Yet, the Commission believes that instructional and assessment attention also must be given to the remaining state content standards.

Requirement 4 obliges states to develop optional classroom assessments for content standards not assessed by state tests. These assessments will support educators’ efforts to teach a wide range of skills and knowledge.

We wish to stress that these classroom assessments are *optional*, not mandatory.

Although existing federal guidelines require states to assess all essential content standards, educators must be free to use or develop classroom assessments other than those provided by the state. We believe, however, that states have a responsibility to see that educators understand optional state-developed classroom assessments and know how they could benefit students. We recommend that states conduct professional development activities for educators regarding how to best use these optional assessments for instructional improvement. And we suggest that this professional development also focus on how educators can design their own classroom assessments to measure students’

progress in meeting state standards. We also believe it is critically important for states to make sure that the results of these classroom assessments have a legitimate role in accountability systems. States need to let educators know how results from classroom assessments can be reported, alongside results from state tests, to provide parents and policymakers with a complete picture of students' achievement on all the state's content standards.

Requirement 5

A state must monitor the breadth of the curriculum to ensure that instructional attention is given to all content standards and subject areas, including those that are not assessed by state tests.

Because —

- *students benefit from a rich and deep curriculum; and*
- *state tests that measure high-priority content standards could narrow curricular coverage unless steps are taken to forestall such narrowing.*

The Commission believes that states need to support educators' broad curricular coverage, especially if state tests focus on a small number of high-priority content standards (See Requirement 1). Because students, schools, and school districts are accountable for performance on state tests, these assessments are powerful motivators. They can influence educators' day to day instructional activities dramatically, and they can inadvertently lead to a narrowing of the curriculum as educators work to ensure that students perform well on state tests. A narrowed curriculum would deal almost exclusively with content assessed on state tests.

We believe states, school districts, and schools must monitor the breadth of the curriculum that students experience to ensure that it includes more than the content assessed on state tests. As noted earlier, we recognize that current federal guidelines require states to teach and assess all essential state content standards, and that assessments of such standards can be carried out at the state, district, and/or school levels. Therefore, we recommend monitoring of curricular breadth at these same three levels using quantitative and/or qualitative methods that states and school districts develop.

Requirement 6

A state must ensure that all students have the opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of state standards; consequently, it must provide well-designed assessments appropriate for a broad range of students, with accommodations and alternate methods of assessment available for students who need them.

Because –

- *all students must be given appropriate opportunities to demonstrate the degree to which they have mastered state content standards; and*
- *federal statutes require that such opportunities be offered in particular ways.*

The Commission believes that state tests must be designed and developed to allow participation of the widest range of students, and thus permit valid inferences about the performance of all students, including those with disabilities, those with limited English proficiency, and those with other special needs.

Requirement 6 obligates states to design statewide assessments or appropriate alternatives (for example, panel review, performance testing, or portfolio assessment) that provide accurate and useful information to teachers concerning the degree to which students with special needs have demonstrated the skills and knowledge described in the state's content standards. This requirement is also consistent with federal laws that obligate states to develop guidelines for school districts about how all students participate, that is, (a) in the general assessment without accommodations, (b) in the general assessment with accommodations, or (c) in an alternate assessment aligned with the state content standards.

Requirement 7

A state must generally allow test developers a minimum of three years to produce statewide tests that satisfy the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* and similar test-quality guidelines.*

Because —

- *tests developed too hurriedly neither support instruction nor supply accurate evaluative information for accountability programs; and*
- *there is a widespread misunderstanding that high-quality achievement tests can be developed in two years or less.*

The Commission’s members understand that state policymakers who are eager to improve education may call for state tests to be developed “as soon as possible.” We recognize that the authorization for many states’ test-development efforts often is dictated by annual or biennial legislative and budgetary cycles. We believe however, that the likely educational impact of these tests is far too important for the tests to be developed improperly, and proper test development takes time. Experience informs us that a minimum of three years is needed to develop a state test to assess high-priority content standards in a way that promotes instructional improvement.

To be more specific, it takes at least three years to (a) prioritize a state’s content standards to identify the standards that state tests will assess, (b) analyze the skills and knowledge students must demonstrate for each content standard, (c) develop sufficient numbers of test items for each high-priority standard, (d) evaluate the test items through small-scale pilot tryouts or other review procedures, (e) formally field-test all the test items, and (f) assemble operational test-forms. Moreover, we believe that the kinds of evidence

* See American Educational Research Association. 1999. *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, Washington, D.C.: Author. See also such documents as Pellegrino, J.W., N. Chudowsky, and R. Glaser (Eds.) 2001. *Knowing What Students Know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

regarding test quality called for in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* are genuinely important. It takes time, for example, to assemble sufficient and compelling evidence about the validity of a test.

The development of state tests also takes time because all potential contributors, for instance, teachers, administrators, and citizens, must be given meaningful opportunities to participate in appropriate stages of the test-development process.

Requirement 8

A state must ensure that educators receive professional development focused on how to optimize children’s learning based on the results of instructionally supportive assessments.

Because —

- *most educators are unfamiliar with the instructionally supportive assessment system the Commission advocates; and*
- *it is imperative that educators become adept at using such an assessment system for instructional purposes.*

The Commission realizes that the assessment system we recommend is a new approach that will be unfamiliar to many educators. The kind of state tests we describe and the role we have set forth for classroom assessments (see Requirement 4) in the state’s accountability system are new. Educators will need repeated opportunities to learn how best to use the instructional information that state tests will provide. Educators also will need opportunities to either use state-provided optional classroom assessments or to develop their own classroom assessments that provide information about students’ learning. We urge state policymakers to provide educators with a variety of professional development activities designed to increase their success in using the type of instructionally supportive assessment system we advocate.

Requirement 9

A state should secure evidence that supports the ongoing improvement of its state assessments to ensure those assessments are (a) appropriate for the accountability purposes for which they are used, (b) appropriate for determining whether students have attained state standards, (c) appropriate for enhancing instruction, and (d) not the cause of negative consequences.

Because —

- *any assessment system, no matter how well designed, can be improved; and*
- *a state's assessment system must perform both an accountability function and an instructional improvement function.*

The Commission believes that assessment systems need to be evaluated and improved on a continuing basis to ensure that they fulfill their intended purposes. We think this final requirement is especially important because we are recommending a new approach to state testing. The tests the Commission advances in this report represent a new generation of state tests that provide information for accountability purposes as well as information for improving instruction. Furthermore, we have described a new kind of assessment system in which results from state tests that focus on high-priority content standards are combined with results from classroom assessments that focus on other state content standards and, together, provide a more complete picture of students' learning than would be provided by a single form of assessment.

We recommend that states undertake independent evaluations to see if state and classroom assessments function as we have described in this report. We also think it is important for independent evaluations and studies to determine the degree to which a

state's students have had an opportunity to learn what is necessary to attain the state's content standards. And it is important for such studies to provide empirical evidence to demonstrate that assessments specifically designed to detect the impact of effective instruction are, in fact, sensitive to well-conceived instructional interventions. The Commission's chief point here, of course, is that even assessments intended to be instructionally supportive must be regularly scrutinized to make certain that children's learning has been bettered by the implementation of those assessments. Thus, evaluative attention must certainly be given to any unanticipated negative consequences of a state assessment program such as dramatically increased student dropout rates.

A Shared Responsibility

The members of this Commission have set forth requirements we believe must be satisfied for a statewide assessment system to benefit all students. We believe that our nine requirements, if satisfied, will lead to state assessment programs that greatly increase the likelihood of educators' promoting the kinds of achievement a state desires for its students. We also think that these assessment programs will provide policymakers with the evaluative evidence they need to make accountability programs function in the long-term best interests of their state's children.

We have described the assessment system we envision as *responsible assessments for the improvement of learning*. If a state's educational policymakers have an opportunity to install such instructionally supportive tests, yet do not do so, then it seems to us that such a failure to capitalize on an opportunity to benefit children constitutes a form of educational irresponsibility.

We suggest, therefore, that all of those who have an interest in the quality of a state's education system, from its governor to each individual citizen, exert whatever influence they possess to make sure that the assessment system in their state satisfies the Commission's requirements. The education of our children is, after all, a shared responsibility.

Commission Members

Eva L. Baker

A Professor of Educational Psychology and Social Research Methods at the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, Eva L. Baker has directed the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) since 1975. Dr. Baker is also Co-Director of the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), a competitively awarded national institution funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Former president of the Educational Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association, Dr. Baker has been a national officer of the American Educational Research Association, and is a former editor of *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. A congressionally appointed member of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, she currently serves on the Independent Review Committee on the Evaluation of Title I Testing. She is co-chair of the committee to revise the standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, and is a member of the Advisory Committee on Education Statistics for the National Center for Educational Statistics. Dr. Baker's research focuses on the integration of instruction and measurement, and she is presently involved in the design of technologically sophisticated testing and evaluation systems of performance assessment in large-scale environments for both military and civilian education.

David C. Berliner

David C. Berliner, Regents' Professor, School of Education at Arizona State University, has taught at the Universities of Arizona and Massachusetts, Teachers College, Stanford University, as well as at universities in Australia and Spain. He most recently served as the Dean of the College of Education, Arizona State University. Dr. Berliner is a member of the National Academy of Education, a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and a past president of both the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Division of Educational Psychology of the American Psychological Association (APA). From 1970-77, he was Associate Laboratory Director for Research, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (now WestEd). He is the recipient of awards for distinguished contributions from APA, AERA, and the National Education Association (NEA). Dr. Berliner has co-authored a number of books, including a best-seller, *The Manufactured Crisis*, with B.J. Biddle, *Putting Research to Work*, with Ursula Casanova, and *Educational Psychology* (textbook), with N.L. Gage. He has also authored more than 150 published articles, technical reports and book chapters, and is the co-editor of *The Handbook of Educational Psychology* and the books *Talks to Teachers* and *Perspectives on Instructional Time*.

Carol Camp Yeakey

Carol Camp Yeakey is Professor of Urban Politics and Policy at the Curry School of Education, University of Virginia. She has taught at Columbia University's Teachers College, Rutgers, Purdue University, and De Paul University, where she also served as Vice Provost of Academic Affairs. While at the University of Virginia, she has chaired the Graduate Program in Policy Studies, designed a new graduate degree program in Policy Studies, and established internship experiences in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan region. In addition, she conducts the Annual Policy Institute, which involves national and state legislative leaders. Dr. Camp Yeakey currently teaches graduate courses in education policy research and analysis, advises graduate students, and supervises graduate research. She has been a Ford Fellow of the Academy of Education, a Rockefeller Fellow in Educational Policy Research at Yale, and a Dartmouth Fellow at the College's Center for the Study of Comparative Politics and Intergroup Relations, among other academic honors. Dr. Camp Yeakey is the author of numerous books, articles, and book chapters.

James W. Pellegrino

James W. Pellegrino is Liberal Arts and Sciences Distinguished Professor of Cognitive Psychology and Distinguished Professor of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). He also serves as co-director of a new interdisciplinary center at UIC focused on cognition, instruction, assessment, and teacher development. Prior to coming to Chicago, Dr. Pellegrino was the Frank W. Mayborn Professor of Cognitive Studies at Vanderbilt University, where he also served as co-director of the Learning Technology Center (1989-91) and as Dean of Vanderbilt's Peabody College of Education and Human Development (1992-98). He has taught at the University of Pittsburgh and the University of California at Santa Barbara, where he served as Chair of the Department of Education from 1987 to 1989. For more than 25 years, Dr. Pellegrino has researched children's and adult's thinking and learning, and the implications of cognitive research and theory for assessment and instructional practice. He chaired the National Academy of Science/National Research Council Study Committee for the Evaluation of the National and State Assessments of Educational Progress, which in 1999 produced *Grading the Nation's Report Card: Evaluating NAEP and Transforming the Assessment of Educational Progress*. He is a member of the Board on Testing and Assessment of the National Research Council. Dr. Pellegrino has authored or co-authored more than 185 books, chapters, and journal articles over his career.

W. James Popham (Chair)

W. James Popham is Professor Emeritus, UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. He has spent most of his career as a teacher, largely at the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, where he taught courses in instructional methods for prospective teachers and courses in evaluation and measurement for masters and doctoral candidates for nearly three decades. In January 2000, he was recognized by *UCLA Today* as one of the university's top 20 professors of the twentieth century, and was awarded the 1997 Lifetime Achievement in Educational Research and Measurement by the California Educational Research Association. In 1968, Dr. Popham founded IOX Assessment Associates, a research and development group that created statewide student achievement tests for a dozen states. In 1978, he was elected president of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and is the founding editor of *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, AERA's quarterly journal. Dr. Popham has written 20 books, including *Testing! Testing! What Every Parent Should Know About School Tests*, 180 journal articles, 50 research reports, and 150 papers presented before research societies.

Rachel F. Quenemoen

Rachel F. Quenemoen is a Senior Fellow for Technical Assistance and Research at the National Center on Education Outcomes, University of Minnesota. Prior to joining the Center staff in 1999, she spent time as a public health administrator, and she was also a technical assistance coordinator with the Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning. She began her career as an educational administrator of regional special and regular education services serving public and nonpublic schools in Minnesota. Ms. Quenemoen has conducted presentations on assessment and accountability issues at forums across the country, and has authored many articles on standards, accountability, and assessment.

Flora V. Rodríguez-Brown

Flora V. Rodríguez-Brown is a Professor of Curriculum and Instruction/Reading, Writing, and Literacy, University of Illinois at Chicago. In addition, she is the Coordinator of Bilingual/ESL Training Programs where she directs the university's recruiting, advising, and training of students in bilingual and ESL education. She also directs a family literacy program and is working on restructuring a public school in Chicago. Dr. Rodríguez-Brown's research includes studies on language proficiency and discourse patterns with bilingual children, attitudes and their relation to second language learning, and the role of transfer and metacognitive strategies in the development of spelling skills in a second language. Since joining the University of Chicago faculty in 1982, Dr. Rodríguez-Brown has taught courses in methodology of language arts and social studies, philosophy of bilingual education, curriculum development for non-

English speaking children. She is the author of numerous articles, book chapters, and monographs.

Paul D. Sandifer

Before becoming a consultant to the Office of Assessment at the South Carolina Department of Education in October, 2000, Paul D. Sandifer was its Interim Director. In that capacity, his responsibilities related to the development, administration, and maintenance of the state's assessment system for grades K-12, as well as the validation of examinations used to certify teachers and administrators. Dr. Sandifer also served as Director of South Carolina's Office of Student Performance Assessment where, among other duties, he was responsible for the state's Basic Skills Assessment Program, including test development, annual administration to approximately 315,000 students, reporting test results, and managing testing contracts. From 1974-1991, Dr. Sandifer was Director of the South Carolina Department of Education's Office of Research. From 1992-1997, he was Assistant Vice President, Development Division, ACT, Inc. (formerly American College Testing). In that capacity, he supervised the development and maintenance of the ACT Assessment Program, the eighth and tenth grade programs, post-secondary placement examinations, and college outcome measures. He has also supervised contracted test development for state education agencies and other organizations.

Stephen G. Sireci

As an Associate Professor in the Center for Education Assessment, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Stephen Sireci teaches graduate courses in test development, statistics, scaling methods, educational assessment, validity theory and research methods, and supervises doctoral students' research. His current research activities include evaluating test comparability across languages, assessing test dimensionality, implementing innovative scaling and standard setting methodologies, appraising test validity, designing computer-based tests and performance assessments, estimating the reliability and validity of scores from complex test designs, improving the attitudes of teachers and minority students towards standardized testing, and refining emerging conceptualizations of validity. As a Senior Psychometrician at the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C., Dr. Sireci directed, supervised, and coordinated research and test development activities related to the Tests of General Educational Development (GED Tests), administered to more than 800,000 adults annually. He also has served as a psychometrician at the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and as a pre-doctoral fellow at the Educational Testing Service. Dr. Sireci is the author of many journal articles and book chapters.

Martha L. Thurlow

Martha Thurlow is the Director of the National Center on Educational Outcomes at the University of Minnesota. As Director, she addresses the implications of contemporary U.S. policy and practice for students with disabilities, including national and statewide assessment policies and practices, standards-setting efforts, and graduation requirements. In addition, Dr. Thurlow is a senior research associate, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota. She has worked with diverse groups of stakeholders to identify key outcomes for young children and students in grades 4, 8, and 12, and at the post-school level. For the past 25 years, Dr. Thurlow has conducted a wide variety of research studies in special education including assessment and decision making, learning disabilities, and effective classroom instruction. She has authored numerous books and book chapters, and has published more than 200 articles and reports. In 1995, she became co-editor of *Exceptional Children*, the research journal of the Council for Exceptional Children.